

OSS Evaluation Project Report – Test Results

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR5-3-E	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Billing Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Billing Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>Twelve percent of the BearingPoint-calculated and SBC Ameritech-reported values do not match for the August 2002 CLEC Aggregate Performance Measurement Report for the Billing Measure Group. Therefore, 12 percent of the values are considered to be calculated inconsistently with the documented metrics calculation rules. See Tables 5-7 and 5-8 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 731, issued December 3, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for PM 17 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p>
PMR5-3-F	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Miscellaneous Administrative Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Miscellaneous Administrative Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>Sixty-two percent of the BearingPoint-calculated and SBC Ameritech-reported values do not match for each of the July, August, and September 2002 CLEC Aggregate Performance Measurement Reports for the Miscellaneous Administrative Measure Group. Therefore, 62 percent of the values are considered to be calculated inconsistently with the documented metrics calculation rules. See Tables 5-7 and 5-8 for additional details.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR5-3-G	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Interconnection Trunks Measure Group.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still assessing the July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports for the Interconnection Trunks Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>See Table 5-8 for additional details.</p>
PMR5-3-H	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Directory Assistance/ Operator Services Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Directory Assistance/Operator Services Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>Seventy-six percent of the BearingPoint-calculated and SBC Ameritech-reported values do not match for each of the July, August, and September 2002 CLEC Aggregate Performance Measurement Reports for the Directory Assistance/Operator Services Measure Group. Therefore, 76 percent of the values are considered to be calculated inconsistently with the documented metrics calculation rules. See Tables 5-7 and 5-8 for additional details.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR5-3-I	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Local Number Portability Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the <i>documented metrics calculation rules</i> for the Local Number Portability Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>At least six percent of the BearingPoint-calculated and SBC Ameritech-reported values do not match for each of the July and August 2002 CLEC Aggregate Performance Measurement Reports for the Local Number Portability Measure Group. Therefore, at least six percent of the values are considered to be calculated inconsistently with the documented metrics calculation rules. See Tables 5-7 and 5-8 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 643, Version 2, issued November 21, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the <i>documented metrics calculation rules for PM 95</i> for the July and August 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 732, issued December 3, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for PM 91 for the July and August 2002 data months.</p>

OSS Evaluation Project Report – Test Results

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR5-3-J	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the 911 Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the 911 Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>At least seven percent of the BearingPoint-calculated and SBC Ameritech-reported values do not match for each of the July, August, and September 2002 CLEC Aggregate Performance Measurement Reports for the 911 Measure Group. Therefore, at least seven percent of the values are considered to be calculated inconsistently with the documented metrics calculation rules. See Tables 5-7 and 5-8 for additional details.</p>
PMR5-3-K	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Poles, Conduits, and Rights-of-Way Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Poles, Conduits, and Rights-of-Way Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>Over 41 percent of the BearingPoint-calculated and SBC Ameritech-reported values do not match for each of the July, August, and September 2002 CLEC Aggregate Performance Measurement Reports for the Poles, Conduits, and Rights-of-Way Measure Group. Therefore, over 41 percent of the values are considered to be calculated inconsistently with the documented metrics calculation rules. See Tables 5-7 and 5-8 for additional details.</p>

OSS Evaluation Project Report – Test Results

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR5-3-L	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Collocation Measure Group.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still assessing the July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports for the Collocation Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>See Table 5-8 for additional details.</p>
PMR5-3-M	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Directory Assistance Database Measure Group.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still assessing the July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports for the Directory Assistance Database Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>See Table 5-8 for additional details.</p>
PMR5-3-N	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Coordinated Conversions Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Coordinated Conversions Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>Over 18 percent of the BearingPoint-calculated and SBC Ameritech-reported values do not match for each of the July, August, and September 2002 CLEC Aggregate Performance Measurement Report for the Coordinated Conversions Measure Group. Therefore, over 18 percent of the values are considered to be calculated inconsistently with the documented metrics calculation rules. See Tables 5-7 and 5-8 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 570, Version 2, issued November 21, 2002, states that SBC</p>

OSS Evaluation Project Report – Test Results

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for PM 114 and PM 115 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 631, Version 2, issued November 21, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for PM 114, PM 115, and PM MI 3 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 677, Version 2, issued November 21, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for PM 115 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p>
PMR5-3-O	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the NXX Measure Group.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still assessing the July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports for the NXX Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>See Table 5-8 for additional details.</p>
PMR5-3-P	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Bona Fide Requests Measure Group.	Satisfied	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Bona Fide Requests Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>The score for each of the July, August, and September 2002 data months is 100 percent. See Table 5-8 for additional details.</p>

# OSS Evaluation Project Report – Test Results

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR5-3-Q	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Facilities Modification Measure Group.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still assessing the July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports for the Facilities Modification Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>See Table 5-8 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 813, issued February 27, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for PM CW 1 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 857, issued June 12, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for PM CW 1 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p>
PMR5-3-R	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Other Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for the Other Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>The score for each of the July, August, and September 2002 data months is below the 95 percent benchmark. See Table 5-8 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 594, issued August 7, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for PM MI 11 for the January, February, and March 2002 data months. It has been determined that this issue also applies to the</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>July 2002 data month, as stated in the additional information document issued January 27, 2003.</p> <p>Observation 624, Version 2, issued November 21, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for PM MI 11 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 642, Version 2, issued November 21, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for PM MI 14 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 792, issued January 23, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for PM MI 9 for the July 2002 data month.</p> <p>Observation 847, issued May 15, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for PM MI 14 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 848, issued May 15, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for PM MI 14 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 859, issued June 12, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics calculation rules for PM MI 14 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p>



**Table 5-5: Results for Consistency with Documented Metrics Exclusion Rules**

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR5-4-A	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Pre-Ordering Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Pre-Ordering Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>The score for the August 2002 data month is below the 95 percent benchmark. See Table 5-9 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 850, issued May 22, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics calculations are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 2 for the August 2002 data month.</p>
PMR5-4-B	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Ordering Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Ordering Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>The score for each of the July, August, and September 2002 data months is below the 95 percent benchmark. See Table 5-9 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 584, Version 2, issued January 3, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 11 for the July and August 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 687, Version 2, issued November 21, 2002, states that SBC</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 10.4 for the July and August 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 688, Version 2, issued November 21, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 9 for the July and August 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 725, issued December 3, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 10.4 and PM MI 2 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 743, issued December 12, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 7.1 for the July and August 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 746, issued December 12, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 13 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 755, issued December 17, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 10.1, PM 10.2, PM 10.3, PM 11.1, and PM 11.2 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 778, issued December 31, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 5.2 for the July 2002 data month.</p> <p>Observation 787, issued January 16, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 5, PM 6, PM 7, and PM 13.1 for the July,</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 803, issued February 13, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 10 and PM 11 for the July and August 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 854, issued May 29, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 7 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p>
PMR5-4-C	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Provisioning Measure Group.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still assessing the July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports for the Provisioning Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>See Table 5-9 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 739, issued December 10, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 28 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 776, issued December 31, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 55.1 for the July 2002 data month.</p>
PMR5-4-D	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Maintenance & Repair	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still assessing the July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports for the Maintenance &amp; Repair Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the</p>

# OSS Evaluation Project Report – Test Results

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	Measure Group.		documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.  See Table 5-9 for additional details.
PMR5-4-E	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Billing Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Billing Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>Twelve percent of the BearingPoint-calculated and SBC Ameritech-reported values do not match for the August 2002 CLEC Aggregate Performance Measurement Report for the Billing Measure Group. Therefore, 12 percent of the values are considered to be calculated inconsistently with the documented metrics exclusion rules. See Tables 5-7 and 5-9 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 694, Version 2, issued November 21, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 19 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 845, issued May 12, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 18 for the July and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 846, issued May 12, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 19 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR5-4-F	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Miscellaneous Administrative Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Miscellaneous Administrative Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>Sixty-two percent of the BearingPoint-calculated and SBC Ameritech-reported values do not match for each of the July, August, and September 2002 CLEC Aggregate Performance Measurement Reports for the Miscellaneous Administrative Measure Group. Therefore, 62 percent of the values are considered to be calculated inconsistently with the documented metrics calculation rules. See Tables 5-7 and 5-8 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 837, issued April 15, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 25 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR5-4-G	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Interconnection Trunks Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Interconnection Trunks Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>The score for each of the July, August, and September 2002 data months is below the 95 percent benchmark. See Table 5-9 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 804, issued February 13, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 75 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p>
PMR5-4-H	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Directory Assistance/Operator Services Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the for the Directory Assistance/Operator Services Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>Seventy-six percent of the BearingPoint-calculated and SBC Ameritech-reported values do not match for each of the July, August, and September 2002 CLEC Aggregate Performance Measurement Reports for the Directory Assistance/Operator Services Measure Group. Therefore, 76 percent of the values are considered to be calculated inconsistently with the documented metrics exclusion rules. See Tables 5-7 and 5-9 for additional details.</p>
PMR5-4-I	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Local

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Local Number Portability Measure Group.		<p>Number Portability Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>At least six percent of the BearingPoint-calculated and SBC Ameritech-reported values do not match for each of the July and August 2002 CLEC Aggregate Performance Measurement Reports for the Local Number Portability Measure Group. Therefore, at least six percent of the values are considered to be calculated inconsistently with the documented metrics exclusion rules. See Tables 5-7 and 5-9 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 710, issued November 27, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 96, PM 97, and PM 98 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 747, issued December 12, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 100 and PM 101 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 755, issued December 17, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 95 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 834, issued April 14, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 91 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 835, issued April 14, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 91 for the July, August, and September 2002</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			data months.
PMR5-4-J	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the 911 Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the 911 Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>At least seven percent of the BearingPoint-calculated and SBC Ameritech-reported values do not match for each of the July, August, and September 2002 CLEC Aggregate Performance Measurement Reports for the 911 Measure Group. Therefore, at least seven percent of the values are considered to be calculated inconsistently with the documented metrics exclusion rules. See Tables 5-7 and 5-9 for additional details.</p>



Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR5-4-K	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Poles, Conduits, and Rights-of-Way Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Poles, Conduits, and Rights-of-Way Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>Over 41 percent of the BearingPoint-calculated and SBC Ameritech-reported values do not match for each of the July, August, and September 2002 CLEC Aggregate Performance Measurement Reports for the Poles, Conduits, and Rights-of-Way Measure Group. Therefore, over 41 percent of the values are considered to be calculated inconsistently with the documented metrics exclusion rules. See Tables 5-7 and 5-9 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 623, Version 2, issued November 21, 2002, that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 105 and PM 106 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p>
PMR5-4-L	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Collocation Measure Group.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still assessing the July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports for the Collocation Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>See Table 5-9 for additional details.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR5-4-M	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Directory Assistance Database Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Directory Assistance Database Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>The score for each of the July, August, and September 2002 data months is below the 95 percent benchmark. See Table 5-9 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 689, Version 2, issued November 21, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 110 and PM 111 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR5-4-N	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Coordinated Conversions Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Coordinated Conversions Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>Over 18 percent of the BearingPoint-calculated and SBC Ameritech-reported values do not match for each of the July, August, and September 2002 CLEC Aggregate Performance Measurement Report for the Coordinated Conversions Measure Group. Therefore, over 18 percent of the values are considered to be calculated inconsistently with the documented metrics exclusion rules. See Tables 5-7 and 5-9 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 738, issued December 10, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 115.1 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 830, issued April 14, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM 115.2 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p>
PMR5-4-O	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the NXX Measure Group.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still assessing the July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports for the NXX Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>See Table 5-9 for additional details.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR5-4-P	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Bona Fide Requests Measure Group.	Satisfied	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Bona Fide Requests Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>The score for each of the July, August, and September 2002 data months is 100 percent. See Table 5-9 for additional details.</p>
PMR5-4-Q	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Facilities Modification Measure Group.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still assessing the July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports for the Facilities Modification Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>See Table 5-9 for additional details.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR5-4-R	SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Other Measure Group.	Not Satisfied (In Retest)	<p>Based on the review of July, August, and September 2002 Performance Measurement Reports, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for the Other Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for three consecutive data months.</p> <p>The score for each of the July, August, and September 2002 data months is below the 95 percent benchmark. See Table 5-9 for additional details.</p> <p>Observation 637, Version 2, issued November 21, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM MI 14 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 661, Version 2, issued on November 26, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM MI 9 and PM MI 13 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 741, issued December 12, 2002, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM CW 5 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p> <p>Observation 787, issued January 16, 2003, states that SBC Ameritech's implemented metrics exclusions are not consistent with the documented metrics exclusion rules for PM MI 9 and PM MI 13 for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.</p>

## 5.2 Test Results Scores

**Table 5-6: PMR5-1 – Scoring for Completeness of Metrics Reporting**

Measure Groups	Months	Total Values <sup>9</sup>	Values Validated	Values in Error	Score
Pre-Ordering	July 2002	592	592	0	100%
	August 2002	592	592	0	100%
	September 2002	592	592	0	100%
Ordering	July 2002	736	736	0	100%
	August 2002	736	736	0	100%
	September 2002	736	736	0	100%
Provisioning	July 2002	12,294	12,294	0	100%
	August 2002	12,294	12,294	0	100%
	September 2002	12,294	12,294	0	100%
Maintenance & Repair	July 2002	5,912	5,912	0	100%
	August 2002	5,912	5,912	0	100%
	September 2002	5,912	5,912	0	100%
Billing	July 2002	51	51	0	100%
	August 2002	51	51	0	100%
	September 2002	51	51	0	100%
Miscellaneous Administrative	July 2002	48	48	0	100%
	August 2002	48	48	0	100%
	September 2002	48	48	0	100%
Interconnection Trunks	July 2002	196	196	0	100%

<sup>9</sup> "Total values" refers to all values SBC Ameritech is required to report for each performance measurement group as defined by the published metrics business rules. This may include all, or some, of the following values depending on the specifications set forth in the business rules: the CLEC numerator, CLEC denominator, CLEC value, retail value, benchmark, z-value, and affiliate value.

OSS Evaluation Project Report – Test Results

Measure Groups	Months	Total Values <sup>a</sup>	Values Validated	Values in Error	Score
	August 2002	196	196	0	100%
	September 2002	196	196	0	100%
Directory Assistance/Operator Services	July 2002	92	92	0	100%
	August 2002	92	92	0	100%
	September 2002	92	92	0	100%
Local Number Portability	July 2002	72	72	0	100%
	August 2002	72	72	0	100%
	September 2002	72	72	0	100%
911	July 2002	40	40	0	100%
	August 2002	40	40	0	100%
	September 2002	40	40	0	100%
Poles, Conduits, and Rights-of-Way	July 2002	22	22	0	100%
	August 2002	22	22	0	100%
	September 2002	22	22	0	100%
Collocation	July 2002	94	94	0	100%
	August 2002	94	94	0	100%
	September 2002	94	94	0	100%
Directory Assistance Database	July 2002	20	20	0	100%
	August 2002	20	20	0	100%
	September 2002	20	20	0	100%
Coordinated Conversions	July 2002	80	80	0	100%
	August 2002	80	80	0	100%
	September 2002	80	80	0	100%
NXX	July 2002	18	18	0	100%

# OSS Evaluation Project Report – Test Results

Measure Groups	Months	Total Values <sup>9</sup>	Values Validated	Values In Error	Score
	August 2002	18	18	0	100%
	September 2002	18	18	0	100%
Bona Fide Requests	July 2002	10	10	0	100%
	August 2002	10	10	0	100%
	September 2002	10	10	0	100%
Facilities Modification	July 2002	511	511	0	100%
	August 2002	511	511	0	100%
	September 2002	511	511	0	100%
Other	July 2002	199	199	0	100%
	August 2002	199	199	0	100%
	September 2002	199	199	0	100%



**Table 5-7: PMR5-2 – Scoring for Agreement of Reported and Independently Calculated Values**

Measure Groups	Months	Total Values	Values Validated	Values in Error	Score
Pre-Ordering	July 2002	592	458	15	≤97.5%
	August 2002	592	297	0	≤100%
	September 2002	592	238	0	≤100%
Ordering	July 2002	736	0	25	≤96.6%
	August 2002	736	0	25	≤96.6%
	September 2002	736	0	25	≤96.6%
Provisioning	July 2002	12,294	6,723	41	≤99.7%
	August 2002	12,294	4,321	0	≤100%
	September 2002	12,294	4,201	0	≤100%
Maintenance & Repair	July 2002	5,912	3,992	116	≤98.0%
	August 2002	5,912	2,303	0	≤100%
	September 2002	5,912	2,064	0	≤100%
Billing	July 2002	51	51	0	100%
	August 2002	51	45	6	88.2%
	September 2002	51	51	0	100%
Miscellaneous Administrative	July 2002	48	18	30	37.5%
	August 2002	48	18	30	37.5%
	September 2002	48	18	30	37.5%
Interconnection Trunks	July 2002	196	196	0	100%
	August 2002	196	196	0	100%
	September 2002	196	193	3	98.5%
Directory Assistance/Operator Services	July 2002	92	22	70	23.9%
	August 2002	92	22	70	23.9%